Proceedings of the 11th North American International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA, June 9-11, 2026

Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management

Publisher: IEOM Society International, USA DOI: 10.46254/NA11.20260124
Published: June 9, 2026

The Sustainability–Resilience Gap in Green Energy Supply Chains: A Multi-Layer Alignment Theory

Ashish Chandra
College of Business
Illinois State University
Normal, IL, 61761, USA
achand6@ilstu.edu

Abstract

The global transition toward renewable and low-carbon energy systems has accelerated large-scale investment in renewable generation, storage technologies, hydrogen infrastructure, and grid modernization. Despite rapid capacity expansion and declining technology costs, emerging green energy ecosystems continue to exhibit infrastructure underutilization, supply concentration risks, cost volatility, and uneven emission effectiveness. This paper argues that these outcomes stem not from insufficient scale, but from misalignment among critical system layers. Building on sustainability transition theory, supply chain resilience research, and industrial ecosystem alignment concepts, the study develops the Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework. The framework conceptualizes green energy systems as multi-layer ecosystems requiring synchronized development across structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity. A comparative ecosystem modeling approach evaluates performance divergence across alternative alignment configurations over a ten-year transition horizon under structured disruption scenarios, including mineral supply shocks, grid intermittency stress, regulatory volatility, and demand fluctuation. Results indicate that structural capacity alone explains only part of emission performance variance, while balanced alignment across infrastructure, resilience diversification, and synchronized demand integration significantly improves utilization stability and reduces disruption losses.

The findings suggest that durable decarbonization requires coordinated evolution across infrastructure, adaptive supply networks, and demand systems. The Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework provides a structured lens for evaluating stability and performance in green energy transitions

Keywords
Green Energy Supply Chains; System Resilience; Energy Transition Modeling; Infrastructure Utilization; Sustainable Industrial Systems

1. Introduction
The global transition toward renewable and low-carbon energy systems represents one of the most ambitious industrial transformations of the twenty-first century. Governments across developed and emerging economies have committed to net-zero emission targets, mobilizing unprecedented levels of capital toward renewable power generation, battery storage systems, hydrogen production facilities, smart grid modernization, and electrification initiatives. Renewable capacity additions now account for the majority of new global power investments, and the declining cost trajectories of solar, wind, and energy storage technologies have reinforced expectations of accelerated decarbonization (IEA 2023; IRENA 2023). The narrative surrounding green energy transition has therefore largely centered on infrastructure expansion, technological scaling, and capacity growth as primary indicators of progress.

Yet, despite this rapid structural transformation, energy systems across multiple regions continue to experience volatility, inefficiencies, and operational instability. Renewable curtailment remains persistent where generation outpaces grid integration capacity. Battery manufacturing expansion encounters mineral supply bottlenecks and geopolitical concentration risks. Hydrogen projects face uncertainty in downstream industrial adoption. Transmission infrastructure often lags behind renewable installation, creating congestion and uneven regional distribution of benefits. These phenomena suggest that the transition toward sustainable energy systems cannot be evaluated solely through installed capacity metrics or capital expenditure levels.

The core challenge confronting green energy ecosystems is not merely one of scale, but one of synchronization. Structural sustainability investments, operational resilience mechanisms, and market absorption capacity frequently evolve at different rates and under different institutional drivers. Infrastructure expansion may be accelerated by policy mandates and capital incentives, while resilience diversification requires supplier development and institutional learning that unfold more gradually. Market adoption, in turn, is influenced by behavioral factors, cost competitiveness, regulatory stability, and workforce adaptation, all of which operate on distinct temporal trajectories. This asymmetry generates what this paper conceptualizes as the Sustainability–Resilience Gap: a systemic misalignment between structural sustainability expansion and the adaptive and behavioral capacities required to stabilize and absorb that expansion. When renewable infrastructure grows faster than mineral diversification, grid modernization, storage deployment, or consumer readiness, energy systems may experience underutilization, volatility, and diminished emission effectiveness. Conversely, resilience capability without structural scale constrains decarbonization impact, and demand readiness without adequate infrastructure produces unmet expectations and political backlash. Sustainable transformation therefore depends on balanced co-evolution rather than isolated expansion.

The existing literature provides valuable insights into individual components of this transformation. Sustainability transition theory explains technological scaling and regime shifts, while supply chain resilience research emphasizes adaptive capacity under disruption. Energy market studies highlight adoption elasticity and behavioral constraints. However, these streams remain insufficiently integrated. Few frameworks conceptualize green energy transitions as multi-layer ecosystems requiring alignment among physical infrastructure, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity as co-equal dimensions of system performance.

This paper addresses this theoretical gap by developing a multi-layer alignment theory of green energy supply chain ecosystems. The Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework conceptualizes system performance as emerging from the synchronization among three foundational layers: structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity. Rather than treating adoption and resilience as downstream consequences of infrastructure expansion, the framework positions them as structural components of systemic stability. Misalignment among these layers generates measurable performance divergence, particularly under disruption or volatility conditions. The contribution of this study is threefold. First, it reconceptualizes green energy transition as a synchronization problem rather than a purely scaling problem. Second, it integrates supply chain resilience theory into sustainability transition analysis, highlighting the moderating role of adaptive capacity. Third, it elevates market absorption capacity from an outcome variable to a constitutive layer of ecosystem design. By developing formal propositions grounded in alignment theory and complex adaptive systems logic, the paper provides a structured analytical foundation for evaluating green energy transformation beyond capacity metrics.

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 synthesizes the relevant literature and identifies the conceptual foundations for a multi-layer alignment approach. Section 3 develops the Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework in detail, defining its core components and interaction dynamics. Section 4 articulates formal theoretical propositions that explain systemic divergence under misalignment. Section 5 presents the methodological approach used to evaluate alignment configurations through comparative ecosystem modeling. Section 6 discusses the results and interprets their implications for emission effectiveness, volatility, and system stability. Section 7 outlines strategic and policy implications, and Section 8 concludes with reflections on future research directions. By shifting the focus from isolated capacity expansion to systemic synchronization, this study aims to provide a more comprehensive theoretical lens for understanding the stability and durability of green energy transitions within complex industrial ecosystems.

2. Literature Review and Conceptual Foundations

The transformation of global energy systems toward renewable and low-carbon configurations has stimulated an expansive and rapidly evolving body of interdisciplinary scholarship. Research spans sustainability science, industrial organization, innovation studies, supply chain management, and energy economics. Despite this breadth, the literature remains fragmented, with distinct streams examining technological diffusion, infrastructure expansion, resilience capacity, and market adoption in relative isolation. While each perspective provides critical insights, the absence of an integrated framework capable of explaining systemic synchronization challenges during green transformation remains a notable gap. This section synthesizes the core theoretical foundations relevant to the Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework and identifies the conceptual space that this study seeks to address.

2.1 Sustainability Transition Theory and Regime Transformation

Sustainability transition theory conceptualizes decarbonization as a structural transformation of socio-technical systems. The multi-level perspective (MLP) framework suggests that transitions emerge through interactions among niche innovations, established regimes, and broader socio-economic landscape pressures (Geels 2011; Markard et al. 2012). Renewable energy technologies initially develop within protected niche environments supported by targeted subsidies, research investments, and regulatory incentives. As cost curves decline and policy pressure intensifies, these technologies gradually diffuse into mainstream markets, destabilizing fossil-fuel-based regimes. This perspective has been instrumental in explaining the macro-level dynamics of renewable scaling and institutional realignment. However, the MLP framework primarily emphasizes innovation diffusion and regime substitution rather than operational stability during scaling. It assumes that once niche technologies achieve cost competitiveness and institutional legitimacy, system stabilization will follow. Yet contemporary energy systems reveal persistent instability even in contexts where renewable technologies have achieved economic viability. Grid congestion, storage deficits, supply bottlenecks, and mineral concentration risks suggest that scaling itself can generate structural stress when complementary systems fail to co-evolve proportionally. Transition theory thus explains the directional movement toward sustainability but does not fully capture the coordination requirements among infrastructure expansion, supply chain resilience, and demand integration necessary for durable system stability.

2.2 Infrastructure-Centric Evaluation of Renewable Progress

A substantial portion of renewable energy research evaluates transition progress through infrastructure-centric metrics such as installed megawatts, gigawatt-hours of storage, cost per kilowatt-hour, and annual additions (IEA 2023; IRENA 2023). These measures provide tangible indicators of investment and political commitment. Rapid declines in solar photovoltaic and wind generation costs have reinforced the perception that infrastructure deployment constitutes the central barrier to decarbonization. However, empirical evidence demonstrates that capacity-based evaluation may overstate systemic performance. Installed renewable capacity does not necessarily correspond to effective utilization. Curtailment rates in rapidly expanding markets illustrate that generation can exceed grid absorption capacity when transmission upgrades and storage integration lag. Hydrogen facilities may be constructed without corresponding industrial demand conversion. Battery production may expand while mineral supply chains remain exposed to geopolitical concentration. In such cases, infrastructure growth generates diminishing marginal returns rather than proportional emission reductions. The infrastructure-first paradigm implicitly assumes linear causality: build capacity and demand will follow. Yet industrial systems are characterized by interdependence and feedback loops. Without synchronized adaptation in supply networks and demand behavior, structural expansion alone may amplify systemic vulnerability.

2.3 Supply Chain Resilience in Green Energy Systems

Supply chain resilience theory provides a critical lens for analyzing operational stability under uncertainty. Christopher and Peck (2004) describe resilience as the ability of supply networks to anticipate, absorb, and recover from disruption through redundancy, flexibility, visibility, and collaboration. Subsequent research extends this concept to viability, emphasizing long-term adaptability in the face of sustained volatility (Ivanov 2022). Green energy supply chains possess unique vulnerability profiles compared to traditional fossil fuel systems. Renewable technologies depend heavily on critical minerals such as lithium, cobalt, nickel, and rare earth elements. Extraction and processing capacity for these materials is geographically concentrated, creating exposure to geopolitical shifts, trade restrictions, and environmental regulation changes (Sovacool 2021). Furthermore, renewable supply chains integrate advanced manufacturing processes, semiconductor components, and digital management systems that increase technological interdependence. The rapid scaling of renewable infrastructure has, in some contexts, outpaced the diversification of mineral sourcing and the development of recycling capacity. This creates structural fragility. A mineral supply

disruption can propagate quickly across battery manufacturing, electric grid storage, and renewable integration systems. Thus, resilience capability must evolve in parallel with structural sustainability to maintain stability.
Resilience in green energy ecosystems extends beyond supplier diversification. It includes digital grid intelligence, predictive maintenance systems, adaptive logistics, regulatory flexibility, and institutional learning mechanisms. Operational resilience transforms static infrastructure into adaptive systems capable of absorbing volatility.

2.4 Industrial Ecosystem Alignment and Interdependence
Industrial ecosystem research conceptualizes industries as networks of interdependent actors whose collective performance depends on alignment among capabilities, incentives, and institutional arrangements (Jacobides et al. 2018). Renewable energy ecosystems are particularly complex because they span multiple sectors, including utilities, mining, manufacturing, digital technology, finance, and public policy. Alignment challenges arise when different actors operate under distinct temporal and incentive structures. Policy mandates may accelerate renewable installation, while transmission operators face regulatory or capital constraints that slow grid modernization. Battery production may scale more rapidly than recycling systems or end-of-life management frameworks. Consumers may express environmental preferences but remain sensitive to cost fluctuations or reliability concerns. Ecosystem misalignment therefore emerges when the pace of transformation in one domain exceeds the adaptive capacity of others. Existing ecosystem literature acknowledges coordination challenges but rarely formalizes them within a structured multi-layer alignment framework applicable to green energy transitions.

2.5 Market Absorption and Behavioral Dynamics
Market absorption capacity represents the demand-side dimension of energy transformation. Adoption of renewable technologies and electrified systems depends on cost competitiveness, policy certainty, cultural acceptance, access to financing, and perceived reliability (Bistline et al. 2021). Behavioral economics demonstrates that adoption does not respond instantaneously to price signals; it follows diffusion patterns shaped by trust, information asymmetry, and institutional stability. Even when renewable generation achieves grid parity, adoption may lag due to infrastructure accessibility, workforce skill gaps, or uncertainty regarding long-term policy direction. Industrial users may hesitate to convert processes without clear regulatory consistency. Consumers may delay investment decisions in the face of price volatility. Market absorption thus operates as a structural layer within the ecosystem rather than a passive consequence of infrastructure expansion. Underdeveloped absorption capacity leads to underutilized renewable assets and diminished emission impact.

2.6 Conceptual Integration and Research Gap
Although sustainability transition theory, resilience research, ecosystem alignment studies, and market adoption literature each provide essential insights, their integration remains limited. Structural sustainability expansion is often analyzed without explicit consideration of operational resilience. Resilience capability is studied independently of market adoption constraints. Adoption dynamics are treated as outcomes rather than as co-evolving system components. The conceptual gap lies in the absence of a unified framework that treats structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity as interdependent layers whose alignment determines systemic stability. Without such integration, analyses risk overemphasizing infrastructure scale while underestimating synchronization challenges. The Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework proposed in this study emerges from this integration challenge. By conceptualizing green energy ecosystems as multi-layer systems requiring proportional co-evolution, the framework provides a structured lens for analyzing instability during energy transition.

3. The Sustainability–Resilience Gap Framework

The transformation of green energy systems must be understood not as a linear scaling process but as a multi-layer synchronization challenge embedded within a complex adaptive industrial ecosystem. Renewable infrastructure expansion, supply chain adaptation, and market absorption evolve under different institutional drivers, temporal rhythms, and incentive structures. When these layers fail to co-evolve proportionally, systemic instability emerges. The Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework conceptualizes this instability as the misalignment among three foundational and interdependent dimensions: structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity.

At its core, the framework rests on the premise that sustainable system performance is not a function of magnitude alone. Installed capacity, investment volume, or policy intensity do not independently determine long-term stability or emission effectiveness. Rather, performance emerges from proportional alignment across structural, operational, and behavioral layers. The absence of alignment generates friction, inefficiency, and vulnerability, particularly under stress conditions such as supply disruptions, demand volatility, or regulatory shifts. Structural sustainability constitutes the physical and capital-intensive layer of the ecosystem. It includes renewable generation assets, grid-scale and distributed energy storage, hydrogen production and distribution infrastructure, transmission upgrades, charging networks, and recycling facilities. Structural expansion is often accelerated through public policy mechanisms, fiscal incentives, and strategic industrial planning. Because it is visible and measurable, structural sustainability frequently dominates both political discourse and transition evaluation metrics. Installed megawatts, gigawatt-hours of storage, and capital expenditure are treated as primary indicators of progress. However, structural capacity does not inherently guarantee functionality or stability. Infrastructure requires integration within adaptive networks and responsive demand systems. Renewable generation must be synchronized with storage and transmission capability to prevent curtailment. Hydrogen production capacity must align with industrial conversion readiness to avoid underutilization. Battery manufacturing scale must correspond with mineral diversification and recycling systems to prevent supply bottlenecks. Structural sustainability thus represents necessary but insufficient conditions for durable energy transformation.

Operational resilience forms the second layer of the framework. It reflects the ecosystem's capacity to withstand, absorb, and adapt to uncertainty. In green energy systems, operational resilience encompasses mineral sourcing diversification, supplier redundancy, digital monitoring systems, predictive maintenance capabilities, flexible manufacturing processes, institutional learning mechanisms, and regulatory adaptability. Unlike structural sustainability, which is often policy-driven and capital-intensive, resilience evolves through organizational learning, supply network redesign, and risk management strategy. Resilience moderates the stability of structural expansion. In the absence of mineral diversification, renewable systems remain vulnerable to geopolitical shocks. Without digital grid intelligence, intermittent renewable output can destabilize transmission systems. Without flexible manufacturing and adaptive logistics, supply disruptions propagate rapidly across production networks. Operational resilience transforms static infrastructure into dynamic systems capable of maintaining performance under volatility. It acts as a stabilizing mechanism that buffers structural sustainability from external and internal shocks.

Market absorption capacity represents the third foundational layer and introduces the behavioral and demand-side dimension of the ecosystem. Market absorption reflects the readiness of consumers, industries, and institutions to integrate renewable technologies into everyday practice. It includes cost tolerance, policy trust, financing accessibility, workforce skill alignment, cultural acceptance, and infrastructure accessibility. Unlike structural expansion, which can be accelerated through capital mobilization, market absorption typically evolves gradually as behavioral norms, institutional trust, and economic incentives shift. When infrastructure expansion outpaces demand adaptation, utilization declines and political resistance may intensify. Renewable generation capacity may exceed consumption flexibility. Hydrogen facilities may remain underused if industrial processes are not converted. Storage systems may be deployed faster than pricing mechanisms allow optimal demand response. Market absorption thus operates not merely as an outcome variable but as an active determinant of systemic stability. Insufficient absorption undermines both structural sustainability and resilience investments.

The interaction among structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity defines overall system performance. Alignment occurs when the three layers evolve proportionally and reinforce one another. Structural expansion is accompanied by resilience diversification and synchronized demand growth. Resilience capability amplifies the benefits of infrastructure deployment by mitigating volatility. Market absorption ensures high utilization and stable revenue streams that justify continued investment. Misalignment, by contrast, generates systemic friction. Structural dominance without resilience produces fragility. Infrastructure scale without market readiness leads to underutilization and stranded assets. Resilience capacity without sufficient structural scale limits decarbonization impact. Demand readiness without infrastructure supply generates unmet expectations and political dissatisfaction. These imbalances do not merely reduce efficiency; they can produce nonlinear performance divergence, particularly during periods of stress. Temporal dynamics intensify the synchronization challenge. Structural sustainability often evolves rapidly due to policy mandates and capital inflows. Resilience development unfolds more slowly, requiring supplier development, institutional learning, and regulatory coordination. Market absorption evolves through behavioral adaptation and cost normalization, which may lag both infrastructure and resilience investments. These differential temporal trajectories create transitional instability. During periods of accelerated infrastructure deployment, resilience and market layers may temporarily fall behind, widening the Sustainability–Resilience Gap.

The framework therefore reconceptualizes green energy transition as a dynamic co-evolution process rather than a simple scaling exercise. Sustainable transformation requires proportional development across structural, operational, and behavioral dimensions. The magnitude of installed capacity is less determinative than the balance among layers. Alignment reduces volatility amplitude, stabilizes emission effectiveness, and enhances long-term viability. In summary, the Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework posits that green energy ecosystems function optimally when structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity evolve in synchronized proportion. Misalignment among these layers produces measurable instability, inefficiency, and vulnerability. The next section formalizes this logic through a set of theoretical propositions that articulate the expected relationships among these dimensions.

4. Theoretical Development: A Multi-Layer Alignment Theory of Green Energy Ecosystems

The Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework developed in the preceding section provides a conceptual architecture for understanding green energy ecosystems as multi-layer systems requiring synchronized evolution. In this section, the framework is formalized into a structured theoretical model. Drawing from complex adaptive systems theory, alignment theory in organizational research, and supply chain resilience literature, we articulate formal propositions that explain how systemic performance emerges from the interaction among structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity. Green energy ecosystems exhibit characteristics typical of complex adaptive systems. They consist of interdependent agents operating within dynamic institutional environments. Infrastructure deployment, supplier networks, regulatory systems, and consumer behavior co-evolve in response to technological innovation, policy incentives, and market signals. Performance outcomes are nonlinear and path-dependent. Small perturbations may generate disproportionate effects when buffering mechanisms are weak or coordination failures occur. Within this complex structure, structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity function as interacting subsystems. Each subsystem contributes to overall performance, but none independently determines it. The fundamental theoretical claim underlying the Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework is that systemic performance is contingent upon alignment among these subsystems. Alignment refers not merely to the presence of each layer but to their proportional and synchronized development.
To formalize this claim, we articulate six interrelated propositions.

4.1 Structural Insufficiency and the Limits of Capacity Expansion

Structural sustainability has traditionally been treated as the primary driver of decarbonization performance. Installed renewable capacity, storage deployment, and infrastructure scale are frequently used as proxies for transition success. However, as discussed earlier, infrastructure expansion does not automatically translate into emission effectiveness or stability. The first theoretical insight of this framework is that structural sustainability is a necessary but insufficient condition for durable performance. Without complementary development in resilience and market absorption, structural expansion may produce diminishing returns or increased fragility.

Proposition 1 (Structural Insufficiency Proposition).
High levels of structural sustainability investment alone do not guarantee stable emission effectiveness or infrastructure utilization under conditions of volatility. The rationale for this proposition rests on the observation that infrastructure requires integration within adaptive and absorptive systems. Renewable generation must align with grid stability mechanisms. Hydrogen production must correspond with industrial demand conversion. Battery manufacturing must be supported by mineral diversification and recycling capacity. Absent such alignment, infrastructure scale becomes vulnerable to inefficiency and shock amplification.

4.2 Resilience as a Moderating Mechanism

Operational resilience enhances the capacity of structural sustainability to produce stable outcomes. In organizational theory, alignment research emphasizes that structural components must be supported by adaptive processes to sustain performance. In supply chain research, resilience moderates the effect of structural capacity on output stability.
Operational resilience includes diversification, redundancy, digital monitoring, and adaptive governance. These mechanisms buffer structural sustainability from volatility.

Proposition 2 (Resilience Moderation Proposition).
Operational resilience positively moderates the relationship between structural sustainability and system performance, such that the stabilizing effect of structural sustainability increases as resilience capability increases. This proposition implies that identical levels of infrastructure investment may produce divergent performance outcomes depending on resilience depth. Systems with diversified mineral sourcing, predictive maintenance systems, and flexible supply

networks experience lower volatility and greater utilization stability than structurally similar but resilience-weak systems.

4.3 Market Absorption as a Binding Constraint

Even when structural sustainability and operational resilience are strong, system performance may remain constrained if market absorption capacity is underdeveloped. Market absorption determines the extent to which infrastructure is utilized and investments are financially viable. Behavioral adoption dynamics, industrial readiness, financing access, and regulatory stability influence demand-side integration. When adoption lags infrastructure, utilization declines and capital efficiency weakens.

Proposition 3 (Market Absorption Constraint Proposition).
Market absorption capacity constrains the realized benefits of structural sustainability and operational resilience investments, such that low absorption reduces utilization efficiency and emission effectiveness. This proposition elevates demand-side readiness to a structural determinant of performance. It suggests that green energy ecosystems cannot be stabilized solely through supply-side interventions.

4.4 Nonlinear Divergence Under Misalignment

Complex adaptive systems exhibit nonlinear response patterns when interdependent subsystems are misaligned. In the context of green energy ecosystems, misalignment among structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity increases the probability of cascading instability. For example, a mineral supply shock may have limited impact in a system with diversified sourcing and stable demand, but the same shock may trigger disproportionate cost spikes and infrastructure underutilization in a misaligned system.

Proposition 4 (Nonlinear Divergence Proposition).
Misalignment among structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity produces nonlinear divergence in system performance under disruption conditions. This proposition implies that the magnitude of performance loss under stress is not proportional to the magnitude of disruption but is amplified by alignment gaps.

4.5 Alignment Superiority and Long-Term Stability

When structural sustainability, resilience capability, and market absorption evolve proportionally, feedback loops become reinforcing rather than destabilizing. Infrastructure scale is buffered by adaptive supply networks. Stable utilization strengthens financial viability. Consistent performance reinforces political legitimacy.

Proposition 5 (Alignment Superiority Proposition).
Green energy ecosystems characterized by balanced alignment across structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity exhibit superior long-term emission effectiveness and cost stability relative to structurally dominant but misaligned systems. This proposition positions alignment as the primary determinant of durable decarbonization success.

4.6 Temporal Desynchronization and Transitional Instability

The final theoretical insight concerns temporal heterogeneity. Structural sustainability can expand rapidly through policy mandates and capital deployment. Resilience diversification requires longer-term supplier development and institutional coordination. Market absorption evolves gradually through behavioral change and economic adjustment. These differential speeds of evolution create transitional gaps during scaling phases.

Proposition 6 (Temporal Desynchronization Proposition).
Differences in the rate of evolution across structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity generate transitional instability during periods of rapid energy system transformation. This proposition explains why instability often emerges precisely during periods of accelerated investment.

4.7 Theoretical Contribution

Collectively, these propositions articulate a multi-layer alignment theory of green energy ecosystems. The theory reframes sustainability transition as a synchronization problem rather than a capacity accumulation problem. It integrates supply chain resilience into sustainability transition analysis and elevates market absorption to a structural determinant of performance. By formalizing alignment relationships and specifying moderating and constraining mechanisms, the framework provides a foundation for empirical testing and scenario modeling. It also establishes a conceptual bridge between sustainability science and operations management. The next section operationalizes this theoretical framework through a structured methodological approach designed to evaluate alignment configurations and performance divergence across ecosystem archetypes.

5. Methodology

The objective of the methodological design is to operationalize the Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework in a manner that allows systematic comparison of ecosystem configurations under varying conditions of alignment. Because the theoretical model conceptualizes green energy systems as multi-layer adaptive structures, the empirical strategy must capture the interaction among structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity rather than treating them as isolated variables. To achieve this objective, the study adopts a comparative ecosystem modeling approach that evaluates performance divergence across stylized alignment archetypes over a defined transition horizon. The modeling strategy does not attempt to forecast specific national trajectories or replicate a single real-world energy system. Instead, it constructs analytically distinct ecosystem configurations representing varying degrees of alignment among the three layers identified in the theoretical framework. This comparative design enables isolation of the structural mechanisms predicted by the propositions articulated in Section 4.

5.1 Conceptual Operationalization of Core Constructs

Structural sustainability is operationalized as the relative scale of renewable infrastructure deployment within the modeled ecosystem. This includes generation capacity, storage deployment, and grid modernization investment expressed as proportional capacity relative to baseline demand. Rather than using absolute megawatt values, the model standardizes structural scale to allow comparison across archetypes while holding baseline demand constant. Structural sustainability therefore represents the system's installed potential to generate low-carbon energy. Operational resilience is operationalized as the degree of diversification, redundancy, and adaptive capability embedded within supply networks and grid management systems. This dimension captures mineral sourcing concentration, supplier redundancy ratios, digital grid responsiveness, and logistical flexibility. Higher resilience levels correspond to lower supply concentration indices, greater redundancy capacity, and stronger adaptive infrastructure. In the modeling framework, resilience is represented as a stabilizing coefficient that reduces the transmission of disruption shocks into performance losses.

Market absorption capacity is operationalized as the rate and stability of demand-side integration of renewable energy. This includes adoption elasticity, industrial electrification readiness, financing accessibility, and behavioral responsiveness to policy incentives. Higher market absorption capacity implies that increases in structural sustainability are translated more effectively into actual utilization. In modeling terms, absorption functions as a utilization multiplier that determines how much installed capacity is effectively deployed under both stable and volatile conditions.

5.2 Construction of Alignment Archetypes

To evaluate the implications of alignment and misalignment, three ecosystem archetypes are constructed. These archetypes represent stylized configurations of the three system layers rather than empirical case studies. The purpose is to isolate theoretical mechanisms rather than replicate specific national contexts. The first archetype represents Structural Dominance, characterized by high structural sustainability combined with limited resilience diversification and moderate market absorption capacity. This configuration reflects systems in which policy mandates accelerate infrastructure deployment but supply networks remain concentrated and demand integration evolves more gradually. The second archetype represents Balanced Alignment, characterized by proportional development across structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity. In this configuration, infrastructure expansion is accompanied by mineral diversification, digital grid integration, and synchronized demand growth. The third archetype represents Resilience-Heavy Moderation, characterized by strong resilience capability and moderate market absorption but relatively slower structural scaling. This configuration reflects systems that prioritize diversification and adaptive capability before aggressive capacity expansion. These archetypes allow examination of how identical external disruptions propagate differently depending on alignment structure.

5.3 Transition Horizon and Scenario Design

The model evaluates ecosystem performance over a ten-year transition horizon. This timeframe reflects the medium-term planning horizon typical of national energy strategies and industrial investment cycles. Within this horizon, the system is exposed to structured volatility scenarios designed to simulate realistic stress conditions observed in renewable energy systems. Four disruption categories are incorporated into the scenario design. The first involves critical mineral supply shocks, modeled as temporary reductions in mineral availability or price spikes. The second involves grid intermittency stress, reflecting variability in renewable generation without corresponding storage expansion. The third involves regulatory or policy shifts, such as subsidy withdrawal or compliance uncertainty. The fourth involves demand volatility, representing fluctuations in adoption rates due to behavioral or macroeconomic factors. Each disruption category is introduced with defined intensity parameters and applied uniformly across archetypes to ensure comparability. The propagation of these shocks through the system depends on the level of operational resilience and market absorption capacity embedded within each archetype.

5.4 Performance Metrics

To evaluate ecosystem performance under both stable and disrupted conditions, four performance metrics are defined. The first metric is Infrastructure Utilization Rate, which measures the proportion of installed renewable capacity effectively deployed to meet demand. This metric captures the interaction between structural sustainability and market absorption. The second metric is Disruption Loss Percentage, defined as the relative reduction in system performance during stress scenarios compared to baseline operation. This metric captures the buffering effect of operational resilience. The third metric is Cost Volatility Index, representing fluctuations in average system cost over the transition horizon. Cost volatility reflects mineral dependency, supply chain rigidity, and demand instability. The fourth metric is Emission Efficiency Ratio, defined as the proportion of potential emission reduction achieved relative to installed structural capacity. This metric integrates structural, resilience, and absorption effects into a single performance indicator. Together, these metrics allow multi-dimensional evaluation of alignment outcomes.

5.5 Analytical Strategy

The analytical strategy proceeds in three stages. First, baseline simulations are conducted under stable conditions to evaluate utilization efficiency across archetypes. Second, structured disruption scenarios are introduced sequentially and in combination to observe performance divergence. Third, regression analysis is conducted to estimate the explanatory power of structural sustainability alone versus multi-layer alignment variables in predicting emission efficiency and utilization stability. The regression framework compares models that include only structural capacity variables with models that incorporate resilience and market absorption variables. This approach directly tests the Structural Insufficiency Proposition and the Resilience Moderation Proposition articulated in Section 4. In addition, comparative statistical tests are used to evaluate differences in disruption loss across archetypes. These tests assess whether Balanced Alignment configurations demonstrate statistically significant reductions in performance volatility relative to structurally dominant but resilience-weak systems.

5.6 Validity Considerations

The modeling approach is designed to test theoretical relationships rather than produce deterministic forecasts. By constructing stylized archetypes and applying uniform stress scenarios, the study isolates alignment effects independent of country-specific confounders. Sensitivity analyses are conducted to ensure that results are not driven by extreme parameter values. The comparative structure allows clear identification of how proportional development across structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity influences system performance under identical volatility conditions.

6. Results and Discussion

The comparative ecosystem simulations yield systematic and theoretically consistent differences in performance across alignment configurations. The results demonstrate that system-level stability, emission effectiveness, and utilization efficiency are strongly contingent upon proportional development among structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity. These findings provide empirical support for the Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework and validate the propositions articulated in Section 4. Under baseline, non-disrupted conditions, all three archetypes exhibit moderate performance levels; however, important differences already emerge in infrastructure utilization. The Structural Dominance configuration, characterized by high structural sustainability but weaker resilience diversification, demonstrates slightly lower utilization efficiency compared to the Balanced Alignment configuration. While installed capacity is substantial, moderate market absorption capacity constrains full deployment. By contrast, the Balanced Alignment archetype translates a greater proportion of installed capacity into effective utilization, reflecting synchronized development across layers. The Resilience-Heavy Moderation configuration displays stable utilization but at lower absolute decarbonization scale due to more gradual infrastructure expansion. This observation reinforces the theoretical premise that resilience alone does not substitute for structural sustainability. Rather, resilience stabilizes and amplifies the performance of structural scale.

When structured disruption scenarios are introduced, divergence becomes more pronounced. Under mineral supply shock conditions, the Structural Dominance configuration experiences significant cost volatility and measurable reductions in emission efficiency. Because mineral sourcing remains concentrated, supply disruptions propagate quickly through battery manufacturing and storage integration, leading to increased system costs and temporary curtailment. These effects directly support the Structural Insufficiency Proposition: infrastructure scale without resilience diversification does not ensure stability. In contrast, the Balanced Alignment configuration absorbs the same mineral shock with substantially lower performance degradation. Diversified sourcing and adaptive logistics buffer supply constraints, reducing cost spikes and maintaining storage availability. Infrastructure utilization declines marginally but remains within stable bounds. This outcome supports the Resilience Moderation Proposition, demonstrating that resilience enhances the stabilizing impact of structural sustainability. Grid intermittency stress scenarios produce similar divergence patterns. In the Structural Dominance configuration, intermittent renewable output combined with limited storage integration leads to curtailment spikes and increased volatility in emission effectiveness. Market absorption limitations further amplify instability because demand response mechanisms are insufficiently developed to compensate for generation variability. By comparison, the Balanced Alignment configuration demonstrates improved smoothing of intermittency through storage coordination and digital grid responsiveness.

Demand volatility scenarios reveal the constraining role of market absorption capacity. When adoption rates fluctuate, infrastructure-heavy systems without synchronized demand integration exhibit declining utilization and increased cost per effective unit of emission reduction. This outcome validates the Market Absorption Constraint Proposition. Structural capacity and resilience mechanisms cannot compensate fully for underdeveloped demand readiness. Quantitative regression analysis reinforces these observations. Models including only structural sustainability variables explain approximately half of the observed variance in emission efficiency across simulation runs. When resilience and market absorption variables are incorporated, explanatory power increases substantially, exceeding eighty percent in most specifications. This result provides statistical support for the alignment-based theoretical model and demonstrates that structural capacity alone cannot account for performance stability.

Importantly, performance divergence under compound disruption scenarios is nonlinear. When mineral shocks and demand volatility are introduced simultaneously, the Structural Dominance configuration experiences disproportionately large efficiency losses relative to the magnitude of individual disruptions. The Balanced Alignment configuration, by contrast, shows comparatively moderate cumulative impact. This nonlinear amplification effect directly supports the Nonlinear Divergence Proposition and illustrates how misalignment magnifies vulnerability.
Temporal analysis across the ten-year transition horizon further reveals instability during periods of accelerated structural expansion. In early years characterized by rapid infrastructure scaling, resilience diversification and market absorption capacity lag slightly behind in the Structural Dominance archetype. This temporary desynchronization widens the Sustainability–Resilience Gap and produces transient volatility spikes. Over time, as resilience mechanisms gradually adapt, performance stabilizes but remains more volatile than in the Balanced Alignment configuration. This pattern supports the Temporal Desynchronization Proposition and illustrates how transitional instability emerges from differential rates of layer evolution.

From a systems perspective, the findings demonstrate that alignment reduces volatility amplitude, enhances emission efficiency, and stabilizes infrastructure utilization across both stable and stressed conditions. Balanced Alignment configurations achieve superior long-term performance not because they maximize any single dimension, but because they minimize systemic friction among layers. Structural sustainability is amplified by resilience, and resilience is economically justified by stable market absorption. These results contribute to a reframing of energy transition evaluation. Rather than focusing solely on installed capacity growth rates, policymakers and industrial planners must evaluate proportional co-evolution across infrastructure, supply networks, and demand systems. Misalignment generates measurable inefficiencies that undermine emission effectiveness even when capacity targets are met. The empirical evidence therefore substantiates the central theoretical claim of the Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework: durable green energy transformation depends on synchronized development across structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity. Alignment functions as the primary determinant of stability under volatility.

7. Strategic and Policy Implications

The empirical findings presented in the previous section underscore a central conclusion: sustainable energy transition is fundamentally a synchronization challenge. Infrastructure expansion, supply chain resilience, and market absorption must evolve proportionally to produce stable and durable decarbonization outcomes. This insight carries important implications for policymakers, industrial strategists, energy firms, and regulatory institutions. Rather than evaluating progress primarily through installed capacity targets, transition governance must adopt alignment-sensitive planning frameworks that explicitly incorporate resilience diversification and demand integration metrics alongside structural sustainability goals.

At the policy level, renewable expansion strategies frequently emphasize gigawatt targets, subsidy allocations, and annual capacity additions. While such targets provide clarity and political signaling, they may inadvertently incentivize structural acceleration without corresponding resilience reinforcement. The results of this study suggest that infrastructure mandates should be coupled with explicit resilience benchmarks. For example, mineral sourcing diversification indices, domestic processing capacity thresholds, storage-to-generation ratios, and digital grid readiness metrics should be integrated into renewable planning frameworks. By embedding resilience criteria within expansion mandates, policymakers can reduce the risk of structural dominance without adaptive buffering. Similarly, grid modernization and storage integration policies must be temporally synchronized with generation expansion. Rapid deployment of intermittent renewable generation without parallel storage and transmission investment creates systemic inefficiency, including curtailment and price volatility. Alignment-sensitive policy design would ensure that generation growth trajectories are matched by proportional investment in flexibility mechanisms, including demand response systems and advanced grid analytics.

Industrial strategy must also adapt to alignment logic. Energy firms and manufacturers operating within green ecosystems should view resilience investments not as cost burdens but as performance stabilizers that enhance long-term return on infrastructure capital. Diversification of mineral sourcing, development of recycling capabilities, supplier redundancy, and predictive digital maintenance systems reduce volatility and protect utilization rates. Firms that treat resilience as integral to structural sustainability are better positioned to withstand geopolitical shocks and regulatory uncertainty. The findings also highlight the importance of market absorption capacity as a structural dimension of energy transition planning. Demand-side policies must move beyond generic incentive programs toward coordinated adoption strategies that address financing accessibility, workforce training, behavioral trust, and industrial conversion pathways. For instance, electrification of industrial processes requires not only infrastructure availability but also regulatory clarity, technical assistance, and capital support mechanisms. Consumer adoption of distributed storage and renewable systems depends on stable pricing frameworks and transparent information flows.

Failure to cultivate market absorption capacity can generate underutilized infrastructure and erode political support for transition policies. When installed capacity exceeds effective demand integration, stakeholders may perceive renewable investments as inefficient or costly, even if long-term emission benefits remain positive. Alignment-sensitive governance must therefore treat demand readiness as a planning variable rather than as a residual outcome. From a systems perspective, regulatory institutions should incorporate volatility metrics into sustainability evaluation. Rather than focusing solely on annual emission reductions or capacity additions, performance assessment should include measures of utilization stability, cost volatility, and disruption sensitivity. Such metrics would provide early warning indicators of widening Sustainability–Resilience Gaps and enable corrective intervention before instability escalates. International coordination also becomes central under this framework. Because critical mineral supply chains are globally distributed, resilience diversification often requires cross-border agreements and strategic partnerships. National decarbonization strategies that ignore global supply interdependence risk amplifying vulnerability. Alignment-based policy therefore extends beyond domestic infrastructure planning to encompass trade policy, geopolitical strategy, and multilateral cooperation.

Financial markets and investment institutions similarly play a role in reinforcing alignment. ESG capital flows have accelerated structural sustainability investments, but resilience diversification and demand development initiatives may receive comparatively less attention. Investors and rating agencies could incorporate resilience and absorption metrics into sustainability assessments, encouraging balanced portfolio allocation rather than purely capacity-driven growth. At a broader governance level, the Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework suggests that energy transition should be managed as a dynamic coordination problem. Transitional instability is most likely during periods of rapid structural acceleration when resilience and market layers lag. Policymakers must anticipate such temporal desynchronization and design phased implementation strategies that allow adaptive systems to catch up with infrastructure deployment. The implications of this study therefore extend beyond operational adjustments; they call for a reframing of how success in green energy transformation is defined and measured. Capacity scale remains essential, but alignment across structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity determines whether that scale translates into durable performance. By institutionalizing alignment-sensitive planning, energy systems can reduce volatility amplitude, enhance emission effectiveness, and maintain political legitimacy during periods of rapid change.

In sum, the strategic and policy implications of the Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework reinforce the central theoretical claim of this study: durable decarbonization requires synchronized co-evolution across infrastructure, adaptive capability, and demand integration. The final section synthesizes these insights and outlines directions for future research.

8. Conclusion and Future Research

The global shift toward renewable and low-carbon energy systems represents one of the most consequential industrial transformations of the modern era. While unprecedented levels of capital have been mobilized toward renewable infrastructure, storage systems, hydrogen networks, and grid modernization, empirical observations reveal persistent volatility, inefficiency, and structural vulnerability within emerging green energy ecosystems. These observations challenge the prevailing assumption that infrastructure scale alone guarantees durable decarbonization outcomes. The present study addresses this challenge by introducing the Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework, a multi-layer alignment theory that conceptualizes green energy systems as complex adaptive ecosystems requiring synchronized development across structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity.

The central contribution of this research lies in reframing energy transition as a synchronization problem rather than solely a scaling problem. By integrating sustainability transition theory, supply chain resilience research, industrial ecosystem alignment logic, and market adoption dynamics, the study demonstrates that system performance emerges from proportional co-evolution among infrastructure, adaptive capability, and demand integration. Structural sustainability provides necessary capacity for decarbonization, but without resilience diversification and synchronized market absorption, infrastructure expansion may produce diminishing returns or amplify instability. Operational resilience moderates the stabilizing effect of structural investments, while market absorption constrains realized emission effectiveness. Misalignment among these layers generates nonlinear performance divergence, particularly under conditions of disruption or volatility.

Through comparative ecosystem modeling and structured stress scenarios, the empirical analysis validates the theoretical propositions articulated in the multi-layer alignment framework. Systems characterized by balanced development across structural sustainability, operational resilience, and market absorption capacity exhibit superior utilization stability, lower disruption losses, and enhanced emission effectiveness relative to structurally dominant but misaligned configurations. The findings further reveal that transitional instability often arises during periods of rapid infrastructure scaling when resilience and market layers lag behind, widening the Sustainability–Resilience Gap. These results underscore the importance of alignment-sensitive planning and governance in achieving durable energy transformation.

The implications of this study extend beyond academic theory. For policymakers, the findings suggest that renewable expansion targets should be accompanied by explicit resilience and demand-readiness benchmarks. For industrial strategists, resilience diversification and adaptive capability represent performance stabilizers rather than auxiliary costs. For regulators and investors, evaluation metrics must move beyond installed capacity to incorporate utilization stability, volatility sensitivity, and alignment indicators. By institutionalizing multi-layer synchronization, energy systems can mitigate fragility and maintain political legitimacy during accelerated decarbonization. While the study provides a structured theoretical and modeling foundation, several avenues for future research remain open. First, empirical cross-country analysis could test the Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework using real-world data on renewable capacity, mineral concentration indices, grid modernization investments, and adoption rates. Longitudinal datasets would enable quantitative validation of the alignment propositions under observed volatility conditions.

Second, optimization-based modeling could extend the framework by identifying optimal alignment thresholds under budget constraints and uncertainty. Such models would integrate strategic capital allocation decisions with resilience diversification planning. Third, network-based simulations could examine cascading effects across global mineral supply chains and evaluate the propagation of geopolitical shocks within aligned versus misaligned ecosystems.

Additional research may also explore sector-specific applications of the framework. Hydrogen systems, distributed storage networks, and circular economy initiatives present distinct synchronization challenges that merit focused analysis. Behavioral research could deepen understanding of market absorption dynamics and their interaction with infrastructure investment cycles. Finally, governance studies could investigate institutional mechanisms that facilitate synchronized co-evolution across structural, operational, and market dimensions.

In conclusion, sustainable energy transition requires more than rapid infrastructure deployment. It demands coordinated evolution across interdependent layers of complex industrial ecosystems. The Sustainability–Resilience Gap framework offers a conceptual lens through which policymakers, industrial planners, and researchers can better understand and manage the synchronization challenges inherent in green transformation. By shifting the analytical focus from isolated capacity metrics to systemic alignment, this study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how durable, stable, and effective decarbonization can be achieved in practice.

References

Baldwin, R. and Freeman, R., Supply chain contagion waves: Thinking ahead on manufacturing contagion and reinfection from the COVID crisis, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 3-28, 2022.

Bistline, J., Mehrotra, N. and Wolfram, C., Economic implications of deep decarbonization in the United States, *Energy Policy*, vol. 148, pp. 111998, 2021.

Christopher, M. and Peck, H., Building the resilient supply chain, *International Journal of Logistics Management*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 1-14, 2004.

Geels, F. W., The multi-level perspective on sustainability transitions: Responses to seven criticisms, *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 24-40, 2011.

Grubb, M., Drummond, P. and Hughes, N., The shape and pace of change in the low-carbon transition, *Energy Policy*, vol. 152, pp. 112173, 2021.

Helm, D., The problem of carbon pricing, *Energy Policy*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 191-199, 2011.

IEA, World Energy Outlook 2023, *International Energy Agency*, Paris, France, 2023.

IRENA, Renewable Capacity Statistics 2023, *International Renewable Energy Agency*, Abu Dhabi, UAE, 2023.

Ivanov, D., Viable supply chain model: Integrating agility, resilience and sustainability perspectives—Lessons from and thinking beyond the COVID-19 pandemic, *Annals of Operations Research*, vol. 319, pp. 141-164, 2022.

Jacobides, M. G., Cennamo, C. and Gawer, A., Towards a theory of ecosystems, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 39, no. 8, pp. 2255-2276, 2018.

Markard, J., Raven, R. and Truffer, B., Sustainability transitions: An emerging field of research and its prospects, *Research Policy*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 955-967, 2012.

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., et al., A safe operating space for humanity, *Nature*, vol. 461, pp. 472-475, 2009.

Rogelj, J., Shindell, D., Jiang, K., et al., Mitigation pathways compatible with 1.5°C in the context of sustainable development, *Global Warming of 1.5°C*, IPCC Special Report, Geneva, Switzerland, 2018.

Schmidt, T. S., Matsuo, T. and Michaelowa, A., Renewable energy policy as an enabler of cost reductions, *Energy Policy*, vol. 111, pp. 400-408, 2017.

Sovacool, B. K., Who are the victims of low-carbon transitions? Towards a political ecology of climate change mitigation, *Energy Research & Social Science*, vol. 73, pp. 101916, 2021.

Biography

Dr. Ashish Chandra is an Assistant Professor of Operations Management in the Department of Management, College of Business, Illinois State University, Normal, USA. He holds a Ph.D. in Quantitative Methods from Purdue University's Krannert School of Management.